REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification and indicated that the specification was missing a Brief description of the Drawings. Applicant has amended the specification to add a Brief Description of the Drawings as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner objected to the term "isomerization" on page 18, line 1. Applicants have amended the term to recite "isomerized" as suggested by the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claim 1 as being indefinite. More specifically, the Examiner noted that the claim recited "stream" at step (c), instead of "steam". Applicant has amended the claim to recite "steam" as opposed to "stream" as correctly noted by the Examiner.

In view of the above, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by US 3,161,670 (Adams et al.)

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 3, which comprises allowable subject matter, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

The rejection should be withdrawn.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Conclusion

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extensions of time, to Deposit Account No. 14-1437.

Respectfully submitted,

NOVAK DRUCE DELUCA & QUIGG, LLP

Jason D. Voight

Registration No.: 42,205 Customer No.: 26474 1300 Eye St. N.W.

400 East Tower

Washington, D.C. 20005 Phone: (202) 659-0100 Fax: (202) 659-0105

Dated: September 29, 2005

JDV/SPK